REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-7 and 9-25 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 29 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Therefore, claims 1-7 and 9-25 are present for examination. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-7 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. The claims have been amended as to make this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103914 A1 issued to Dutta ("**Dutta**") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0172717 A1 issued to Malcolm ("**Malcolm**"). Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all claim limitations must first be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See, e.g., DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2006). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (*citing In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)). The Examiner must then provide an explicit analysis supporting the rejection. *See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) ("a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art"). While the Examiner can choose one of several exemplary rationales from the MPEP to support an obviousness rejection under *KSR*, all the rationales still require the Examiner to demonstrate that

Appl. No. 10/808,885
Amdt. dated February 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

PATENT

all the claim elements are shown in the prior art. *See* MPEP § 2143, Original Eighth Edition,

August 2001, Latest Revision July 2008.

Claim 1:

Missing Limitation: "the servlet appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said

web page"

        Claim 1 requires a method comprising "the servlet appending the result of said

analyzing to the content of said web page." The Examiner states that Dutta teaches this claim

limitation. *See Office Action*, p. 3. The relevant section cited by the Examiner is as follows:

> Based on the comparison of the search results to the accessibility level
> requirements of the user profile, certain ones of the entries in the search results
> will be removed from the search results and others will be maintained based on
> whether or not the entries satisfy the accessibility level requirements. *Only those*
> *entries that satisfy the accessibility level requirements are maintained in the*
> *search results.* Alternatively, all of the entries may be maintained in the search
> results with those that do not meet the accessibility requirements being appended
> to include an indicator that the entry does not meet the required accessibility level.
> The filtered search results are then provided to the client device via the client
> device interface 560 and assistive technology device 520.

Dutta, ¶ [0137].

        Dutta, in this section, does not teach the results of an analysis of a web page but

the results of a search of web pages. Thus, any information taught in this section of Dutta cannot

be said to be the "the result of said analyzing [the content of the web page]." Further, the search

results are not appended to a web page. Rather, the search results are simply presented, which

necessarily means the results are not presented as part of the web page. Therefore, the Examiner

has not cited any reference which shows the element of claim 1. For this reason, claim 1 is

allowable over the cited art.

Missing Limitation: "the browser displaying said web page and said result"

        Claim 1 requires a method comprising "the servlet appending the result of said

analyzing to the content of said web page." The Examiner states that Dutta teaches this claim

limitation. *See Office Action*, p. 3. The relevant section cited by the Examiner is as follows:

> The personalized accessibility evaluation provider 530 then supplies the results of
> the search, such as the content itself or the URLs for the search result entries, to

Appl. No. 10/808,885
Amdt. dated February 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

PATENT

the content evaluator 550. The content evaluator 550 evaluates the search results
for conformance with established accessibility criteria and returns a result of the
accessibility level of the entries of the search results.

Dutta, ¶ [0135].

Based on the comparison of the search results to the accessibility level
requirements of the user profile, certain ones of the entries in the search results
will be removed from the search results and others will be maintained based on
whether or not the entries satisfy the accessibility level requirements. *Only those*
entries that satisfy the accessibility level requirements are maintained in the
search results. Alternatively, all of the entries may be maintained in the search
results with those that do not meet the accessibility requirements being appended
to include an indicator that the entry does not meet the required accessibility level.
The filtered search results are then provided to the client device via the client
device interface 560 and assistive technology device 520.

Dutta, ¶ [0137].

Again, Dutta, in these sections, does not teach the results of an analysis of a web
page but the results of a search of web pages. Thus, any information taught in this section of
Dutta cannot be said to be the "said web page *and* said result [of the analysis of the content of the
web page]." Further, the search results are displayed and not the web page for which the result
pertains. The search results are simply presented alone. Therefore, the Examiner has not cited
any reference which shows the element of claim 1. For this reason, claim 1 is allowable over the
cited art.

Missing Limitation: "the analyzer analyzing the content of the web page, prior to encryption *of said secure content"*

Claim 1 requires a method comprising "the analyzer analyzing the content of the
web page, prior to encryption of said secure content." The Examiner states that Dutta does not
teach this claim limitation. *See Office Action,* p. 3. Rather, the Examiner relies on Malcolm. *Id.*
The relevant section cited by the Examiner is as follows:

The use of browser or e-mail client plug-in modules to implement the functionality
of the preferred system has the additional advantage that, since encryption of
message content is usually carried out by the browser or e-mail client itself,
examination of transmission content, to extract password information or to
determine the desired level of encryption for example, may take place before the

Appl. No. 10/808,885
Amdt. dated February 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

PATENT

> content has been encrypted ready for transmission, or indeed after it has been
> received and unencrypted.

Malcolm, ¶ [0060] (*emphasis added*).

> Encryption and decryption on a secure link will take place after point C and
> before point A in FIG. 3 respectively. Thus, the BHO may analyze the data before
> it is encrypted or after it is decrypted. This is advantageous since there is no need
> for the BHO to perform any encoding or decoding of data itself. This does not
> affect the ability to determine if the link is secure or not, since a secure link can be
> identified by the protocol identifier "https" at the beginning of the current URL. It
> is preferred that examination of the transmission's content take place before
> encryption or after decryption occurs.

Malcolm, ¶ [0091].

> Another significant client event that the plug-in module is implemented to
> respond to is the "OnwriteComplete" event which is fired when the user has
> selected the "send command" and requested the e-mail client to transmit a new e-
> mail message to the mail delivery system. This event is fired, at point B in FIG. 5,
> before the transmission and before any encryption takes place. The new message
> which is to be transmitted is similarly stored in memory as an object which may
> be accessed by MAPI calls. The plug-in module may use the MAPI calls to scan
> the content of the outgoing e-mail for sensitive data, such as credit card number,
> and consequently cause the message to be recorded or even blocked.

Malcolm, ¶ [0102].

Malcolm does not teach an analyzer as part of a server. The analyzer in claim 1,
which completes the analysis, is part of the server. Here, Malcolm teaches a plug-in to a
browser. As can be seen in Fig. 1 of the present application, embodiments show the analyzer and
the browser as two different components. This separation is important because the web server
can more easily "push" the web content to the analyzer rather than the browser attempting to find
the analyzer in a DHCP environment. Thus, Malcolm shows a system similar to those discussed
in the background of the present application. Therefore, what Malcolm teaches and the elements
of claim 1 are very different. Therefore, the Examiner has not cited any reference which shows
the element of claim 1. For this reason, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

Appl. No. 10/808,885
Amdt. dated February 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

PATENT

Claims 2-7 and 25:

Claims 2-7 and 25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-7 and 25 are allowable over the cited art due, at least in part, to this dependence on an allowable base claim.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 includes similar limitations as claim 1. For example, claim 9 includes "appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page," and "transferring the content of the web page to an analyzer [where the analyzer analyzes the web content]." Therefore, for the same or similar reasons as claim 1, claim 9 is also allowable over the cited art.

Claims 10-16:

Claims 10-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable independent claim 9. Therefore, claims 10-16 are allowable over the cited art due, at least in part, to this dependence on an allowable base claim.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 includes similar limitations as claim 1. For example, claim 17 includes "appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page;" "displaying said web page and said result," and "analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content." Therefore, for the same or similar reasons as claim 1, claim 9 is also allowable over the cited art.

Claims 17-24:

Claims 17-24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable independent claim 17. Therefore, claims 17-24 are allowable over the cited art due, at least in part, to this dependence on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/808,885
Amdt. dated February 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Tadd F. Wilson
Reg. No. 54,544

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
T3W:s5s
61715148 v1